

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-46 are pending in the present application. By way of this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 10, 17 and 30 have been amended and claims 26-29 and 31-34 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant has canceled claims 26-29 and 31-39 in the interest of expediting this application to issuance, and reserves the right to file the canceled claims in later continuation applications.

**I. Objection to the Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings filed on January 23, 2004 do not have any relevance to the current application. Applicant agrees. The drawings filed on January 23, 2004 were not filed by Applicant's attorney of record, but rather were filed by a patent agent not associated with Applicant or Applicant's counsel. Moreover, the corrected drawings appear to be for a different application, entitled "Microtubes for Surgery and Dentistry." The error appears to have occurred because the corrected drawing communication incorrectly references the present application number instead of the application it was intended for. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the corrected drawing filed on January 23, 2004 not be entered.

In addition, Applicant noticed that an Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 26, 2004 was similarly filed in error, as this Information Disclosure Statement also references an application entitled "Microtubes for Surgery and Dentistry." This Information Disclosure Statement appears to have been filed in the present application because it incorrectly references the present application's filing number as well.

**II. Claim Objection**

The Examiner objected to claim 5 alleging that it is grammatically incorrect. Specifically, the Examiner believes that the use of the word "transform" is grammatically incorrect. Applicant submits that its use of the word "transform" was a typographical error and has amended the claim to

use the word “transfer” instead. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is grammatically correct and, accordingly, requests that this objection be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim Rejections**

The examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Kinnunen et al.; independent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kinnunen et al. and Tucciarone et al.; independent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Ott et al. and Arellano; and independent claim 30 under the “same rational” as claims 1-9 and 17-28.

As amended, both independent claim 1 and independent claim 10 now recites “a community engine server comprising a profile associated with said first user wherein said community engine server is configured to obtain at least one affiliate profile having a format associated with a specific operating system, transform the at least one affiliate profile into at least one common format affiliate profile that is independent of said specific operating system, and compare said profile with at least one common format affiliate profile and obtain a match result.” The claim amendment is supported in the specification in paragraph [0024], for example.

As amended, independent claim 17 now recites “obtaining an affiliate profile having a format associated with a specific operating system of an affiliate server; transforming said affiliate profile to a transformed affiliate profile that is independent of said specific operating system.” This claim amendment is also supported in the specification in paragraph [0024], for example.

As amended, independent claim 30 now recites “means for obtaining an affiliate profile having a format associated with a specific operating system from an affiliate server,” and “means for transforming said affiliate profile to a transformed affiliate profile that is independent of said specific operating system.” This claim amendment is also supported in the specification in paragraph [0024], for example.

As mentioned above, the pending claims were rejected view of a number of different prior art references under various § 102(b) and § 103(a) grounds. However, none of the cited references

disclose either individually or in combination receiving profiles in different formats, for example in formats associated with disparate operating systems, and transforming the received profiles into a common format. In contrast, independent claims 1, 10 require that a community engine server be configured to transform at least one affiliate profile having a format associated with a specific operating system into a common format that is independent of the specific operating system; claim 17 requires “transforming [an] affiliate profile to a transformed affiliate profile that is independent of said specific operating system [of an affiliate server]”; and independent claim 30 requires “means for transforming said affiliate profile to a transformed affiliate profile that is independent of said specific operating system [of an affiliate server].” Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 10, 17 and 30 are allowable over the prior art, as none of the cited reference disclose or suggest these limitations.

#### Dependant claims

Currently, claims 2-9, 11-6 and 18-25 depend upon independent claims 1, 10 and 17, respectively. Because independent claims 1, 10 and 17 are believed allowable, as indicated above, dependant claims 2-9, 11-6 and 18-25, which recite additional unique features, are likewise believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket

no. **595272000100**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Kaare D. Larson/

Kaare D. Larson

Registration No.: 51,920

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100

San Diego, California 92130-2040

(858) 720-5163